Case 3:09-cr-00660-CRB Document 18 Filed 11/19/15 Page 1 of 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,) Case No. CR 09-0660 CRB
Plaintiff, v.) STIPULATED ORDER EXCEUDING TIME) UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
Uly5605 Tykel Davis, Defendant.	NOV 192015 SUSAN Y. SOONG CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on $\frac{11/19/15}{130/15}$, 2015, the Court excludes time under the Speedy Trial Act from $\frac{11/19/15}{15}$, 2015 to $\frac{11/30/15}{15}$, 2015 and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):	
Failure to grant a continuance wou See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	ald be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of the or law, that it is unreasonable to ex	lex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial ished by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	ald deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, f due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
Failure to grant a continuance work counsel's other scheduled case con See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv)	ald unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given mmitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	
IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: 11-19-15	LAUREL BEELER United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Maran L. Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney